IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JOANNE BAYER	:	
1417 Locust Street	:	
Norristown, PA 19401	:	CIVIL ACTION
Plaintiff,	: :	No

v.

CHARLES RIVER LABORATORIES INTERNATIONAL, INC., d/b/a CHARLES RIVER LABORATORIES 251 Ballardvale Street

251 Ballardvale Street Wilmington, MA 01887

Defendant.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, by and through her undersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This action has been initiated by Joanne Bayer (*hereinafter* referred to as "Plaintiff," unless indicated otherwise) against Charles River Laboratories International, Inc., d/b/a Charles River Laboratories (*hereinafter* referred to as "Defendant") for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA" - 42 USC §§ 12101 *et. seq.*) and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA"). As a direct consequence of Defendant's unlawful actions, Plaintiff seeks damages as set forth herein.

¹ Plaintiff's claim under the PHRA is referenced herein for notice purposes. She is required to wait 1 full year before initiating a lawsuit from date of dual-filing with the EEOC. Plaintiff must however file her lawsuit in advance of same because of the date of issuance of her federal right-to-sue letter under the ADA. Plaintiff's PHRA claims however will mirror identically her federal claims under the ADA.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over the instant action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343(a) (4) because it arises under the laws of the United States and seeks redress for violations of federal laws. There lies supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state-law claims because they arise out of the same common nucleus of operative facts as Plaintiff's federal claims asserted herein.
- 3. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendant because its contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction over Defendant to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny.
- 4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), venue is properly laid in this district because all of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district, and Defendant is deemed to reside where it is subject to personal jurisdiction, rendering Defendant a resident of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

PARTIES

- 5. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 6. Plaintiff is an adult individual, with an address as set forth in the caption.
- 7. Charles River Laboratories International, Inc. ("Defendant") is an American pharmaceutical company specializing in a variety of preclinical and clinical laboratory, gene therapy and cell therapy services for the pharmaceutical, medical device and biotechnology industries.

8. At all times relevant herein, Defendant acted by and through its agents, servants and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for Defendant.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 9. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 10. Plaintiff was hired by Defendant effective on or about May 30, 2018; and in total, Plaintiff was employed with Defendant for approximately 3 years.
- 11. Plaintiff worked under various job titles such as TA Specialist, HR Analyst, Reporting Analyst and other iterations of such roles / names as utilized by Defendant.
- 12. Plaintiff reported directly to Joseph Rappaport (Sr. HR Analyst and Data Analytics Manager). And Plaintiff indirectly reported to Victoria Creamer (Chief People Officer) and James Foster (Chief Executive Officer).
- 13. At all relevant times during Plaintiff's employment and as to claims underlying this lawsuit, Plaintiff was managed daily primarily by Rappaport.
- 14. Plaintiff worked for Defendant (headquartered in Massachusetts) in Pennsylvania (and in particular, within Montgomery County). Plaintiff worked remotely from her residence as a telecommuting employee, and she also reported to Defendant's Horsham, Pennsylvania office(s). Thus, Plaintiff was an Eastern-Pennsylvania based employee for Defendant.
- 15. The sole rationale Plaintiff was given by Defendant's management for her termination was that of "job elimination." Plaintiff was not informed of any other reason for her termination, such as misconduct, performance, or other bases.

3

- 16. Plaintiff was terminated effective on or about May 14, 2021, and she was not given any advance notice of an impending or potential termination.
- 17. Although Defendant claimed Plaintiff's job was "eliminated," Plaintiff's termination was solely motivated by discrimination on account of Plaintiff's health, as well as retaliation for her concerns of discriminatory treatment.
- 18. Plaintiff suffered from Anxiety, Depression, and other general health complications, which was known to Defendant's management.
 - 19. Plaintiff's termination reeks of pretext as follows:
 - (1) Plaintiff's immediate manager, Rappaport, was making numerous discriminatory comments to Plaintiff about her health leading up to Plaintiff's termination. Such comments included him telling Plaintiff she was not a good fit in relation to her health, Plaintiff seemed to be in a "dark place" due to what she was going through, Defendant needs someone in Plaintiff's role who has more energy, and Plaintiff's mental state didn't appear to be doing well. These direct discriminatory comments were being made on a continual basis (and other variations of such commentary).
 - (2) Rappaport was suggesting or asking Plaintiff to quit or resign before her job was allegedly eliminated.
 - (3) Plaintiff was upon information and belief the only employee nationwide subject to a reduction in force or job elimination at the same time in which she was allegedly terminated for business reasons.
 - (4) Plaintiff performed duties and a role that still needed to be performed even post-termination, and Plaintiff could have been transitioned to any number of roles that Defendant often hired for or created for employees if they were needing transition.
 - (5) Plaintiff was offered severance pay contemporaneous to her termination that was not required per policies of Defendant if she agreed *to waive all discrimination and retaliation claims against Defendant*. This is clearly <u>admissible</u> evidence of an attempt to conceal and quickly dispense with a discrimination and retaliation claim, and additional evidence of pretext.²

_

² See Staffieri v. Northwestern Human Servs., 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 72115 at **14-15 (E.D. Pa. 2013)(an employer who offered severance at the time of termination when policies did not require upon condition of waiving claim supported finding of pretext among other facts); Bartlett v. NIBCO Inc., 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 28072 (N.D. Ind.

- (6) Plaintiff's feigned job "elimination" happened to occur shortly after she was escalating complaints of discrimination.
- 20. Plaintiff objected to discriminatory treatment by Rappaport, and she also escalated concerns of discriminatory treatment to Rappaport's management. Such concerns were in very close temporal proximity (even weeks) in advance of Plaintiff's abrupt termination.
- 21. Rappaport's management, instead of undertaking any meaningful investigation or remedial action, further suggested Plaintiff just consider resigning.
- 22. Plaintiff was encountering tremendous animosity and demeaning treatment from Rappaport leading up to her termination from employment merely for exhibiting symptoms of Anxiety or other health problems and relaying that the manner in which she communicated at times or for other issues at work were affected by her health.
- 23. Plaintiff's termination as outlined in this lawsuit violated the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA").

COUNT I <u>Violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act "ADA"</u> ([1] Actual/Perceived/Record of Disability Discrimination; and [2] Retaliation)

24. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in

full.

5

²⁰¹¹⁾⁽finding that a severance agreement offered contemporaneously to when the employee was terminated was "probative on the issue of whether NIBCO's motive for terminating Bartlett was [false]."); EEOC v. Republic Servs., Inc., 640 F. Supp. 2d 1267 (D. Nev. 2009)(denying summary judgment and considering as evidence in wrongful termination case that a company would offer severance when an employee is supposedly terminated in a manner that doesn't warrant severance per an explicit company policy); Karl v. City of Mountlake Terrace, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 59085 (W.D. Wash. 2011)(severance agreements are admissible in retaliation claims when made contemporaneous to termination, as they are not governed by Fed.R.Evid. 408); Brandy v. Maxim Healthcare Servs., Inc., 2012 WL 5268365, at *2 (N.D. Ind. 2012)(holding that severance agreements offered at the time of termination do not fall under Rule 408 because they are offered before a dispute arises, regardless if the employer "anticipated the severance agreement curtailing any potential future litigation.").

- 25. Plaintiff timely filed a Charge with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") and initiated this lawsuit within 90 days of receiving a notice of case closure and/or right-to-sue letter.
- 26. Plaintiff was terminated because of [1] her actual and/or perceived disabilities; [2] her record of impairment; and [3] her objections or concerns of discriminatory treatment.
- 27. These discriminatory and retaliatory actions as aforesaid constitute violations of the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:

- A. Defendant is to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff, and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for Defendant's illegal actions, including but not limited to back pay, front pay, salary, pay increases, bonuses, insurance, benefits, training, promotions, reinstatement, and seniority.
- B. Plaintiff is to be awarded punitive damages, as permitted by applicable law, in an amount believed by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendant for its willful, deliberate, malicious and outrageous conduct and to deter Defendant or other employers from engaging in such misconduct in the future;
- C. Plaintiff is to be accorded other equitable and legal relief as the Court deems just, proper, and appropriate (including but not limited to damages for emotional distress / pain and suffering);
- D. Plaintiff is to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable attorney's fees as provided by applicable federal and state law; and
 - E. Plaintiff is to be given a jury trial as demanded in the caption of this Complaint.

6

Respectfully submitted,

KARPE, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.

By:

Ari R. Karpf, Esq. 3331 Street Road Two Greenwood Square, Suite 128 Bensalem, PA 19020 (215) 639-0801

Dated: September 7, 2021

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address	
(215) 639-0801	(215) 639-4970	akarpf@karpf-law.com	
Date	Attorney-at-la	w Attorney for	
9/7/2021		Plaintiff	
(f) Standard Management -	Cases that do not fal	Il into any one of the other tracks.	(X)
commonly referred to as the court. (See reverse s management cases.)	complex and that ne ide of this form for a	into tracks (a) through (d) that are sed special or intense management by a detailed explanation of special	()
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvexposure to asbestos.	ing claims for person	nal injury or property damage from	()
		for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()
(b) Social Security - Cases and Human Services den	requesting review of aying plaintiff Social	a decision of the Secretary of Health Security Benefits.	()
(a) Habeas Corpus - Cases		ϵ	()
SELECT ONE OF THE FO	OLLOWING CASE	MANAGEMENT TRACKS:	
plaintiff shall complete a Ca filing the complaint and serv side of this form.) In the c designation, that defendants	s I Justice Expense and se Management Trace a copy on all defendance that a defendant shall, with its first appricies, a Case Manager	NO. d Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counch Designation Form in all civil cases at the trans. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the rat does not agree with the plaintiff regarding pearance, submit to the clerk of court and sement Track Designation Form specifying the be assigned.	ime of everse g said rve on
v.	:		
Joanne Baye	er	CIVIL ACTION	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Case 2:21-cv-03980-GAPPED SPANES ON TRICTION 100/07/21 Page 9 of 10 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: 1417 Locust Street, Norristown, PA 19401
Address of Defendant: 251 Ballardvale Street, Wilmington, MA 01887
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Defendant's place of business
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:
Case Number:
Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to any of the following questions:
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year Yes No X previously terminated action in this court?
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit Yes No X pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights Yes No X
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case this court except as noted above.
DATE: 9/7/2021 ARK2484 / 91538
Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)
CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only)
A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Labor-Management Relations 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify):
A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: □ 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts □ 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts □ 2. FELA □ 2. Airplane Personal Injury □ 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury □ 3. Assault, Defamation □ 4. Antitrust □ 4. Marine Personal Injury □ 5. Patent □ 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury □ 6. Labor-Management Relations □ 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): □ 7. Civil Rights □ 7. Products Liability □ 8. Products Liability - Asbestos
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. FELA 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Patent 5. Patent 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Civil Rights 7. Civil Rights 7. Products Liability 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 9. All other Pederal Question Cases (Please specify): 9. ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Labor-Management Relations 6. Other Personal Injury 7. Civil Rights 7. Products Liability 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability Asbestos 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. FELA 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury 7. Products Liability 7. Products Liability 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability 9. Pro
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 7. Products Liability 7. Products Liability 7. Products Liability 7. Products Liability 8. Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability 8. Products Liabi
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts

Filed 09/07/21 Page 10 of 10 Case 2:21-cv-03980-9

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I.	(a)	PLAINTIFFS

BAYER, JOANNE

Montgomery (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Karpf, Karpf & Cerutti, P.C.; 3331 Street Road, Two Greenwood Square. Suite 128, Bensalem, PA 19020; (215) 639-0801; akarpf@karpf-law.com

DEFENDANTS

CHARLES RIVER LABORATORIES INTERNATIONAL, INC., D/B/A CHARLES RIVER LABORATORIES

Middlesex County of Residence of First Listed Defendant

(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		III. CITIZENSHIP O	F PRI	NCIP.	AL PARTIES (Place an "X" in	one Box f	for Plaintif f		
		(For Diversity Cases C	(For Diversity Cases Only)			and One Box for Defendant)			
1 U.S. Government	X 3 Federal Question		PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF		
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen of This State	1	1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State	4	4		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2	2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State	5	5		
		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3	3	Foreign Nation	6	6		

IV. NATURE OF SUIT	Γ (Place an "X" in One Box On	ly)	Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.			
CONTRACT	TORTS		FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability	PERSONAL INJURY ' 310 Airplane ' 315 Airplane Product Liability ' 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ' 330 Federal Employers' Liability ' 340 Marine ' 345 Marine Product Liability ' 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ' 360 Other Personal	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage	□ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 □ 690 Other LABOR □ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act □ 720 Labor/Management Relations	' 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ' 423 Withdrawal	□ 375 False Claims Act ' 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions	
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Application Actions	See SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information	

V.	ORI	GIN	(Place an	"X" in	One	Rox Only

2 Removed from

Appellate Court (specify) Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): ADA (42USC12101)

Remanded from

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Brief description of cause:

1 3

Violations of the ADA and the PHRA

VII. REQUESTED IN **DEMAND \$** CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. **COMPLAINT:** JURY DEMAND:

4 Reinstated or

Reopened

5 Transferred from

Another District

6 Multidistrict

Litigation -

Transfer

V	III.	RELA	TED	CA	SE	S)
---	------	------	-----	----	----	---	---

(See instructions): IF ANY **JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER**

DATE SIGNATURE OF AT ORNEY OF RECORD 9/7/2021

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Original

Proceeding

RECEIPT# AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

Print Save As.. Reset

8 Multidistrict

Litigation -

Direct File